

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-32 are pending.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 18-31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, for the reasons set forth below, claims 18-31 have not been rewritten in independent form at this time.

The Office Action rejected claims 15-17 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkswell, U.S. Patent No. 4,687,152, in view of Briehl, U.S. Patent No. 5,941,674 or Umetsu et al. (hereinafter "Umetsu"), U.S. Patent No. 5,289,625. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, a feeding unit installed on a main frame, the feeding unit comprising a forward and backward rotational force generating device comprising a plurality of armature coils and a magnetic unit positioned adjacent the plurality of armature coils. The Office Action stated that Hawkswell discloses:

(Re claim 15) "a feeding unit installed on a mainframe, the feeding unit comprising" (52 figure 2). "a tape at a predetermined pitch interval (38 figure 2)."
"a vinyl separation unit" (68 figure 2). "a vinyl recovery unit" (70 figure 2).

However, the Examiner acknowledges that "Hawkswell does not disclose that the feeding unit is capable of moving forward and backwards driven by a force generating device comprising a plurality of armature coils and a magnetic unit." The Examiner then argues that "Briehl and Umetsu both teach a feeding unit capable of moving forward and backwards driven by a force

generating device comprising a plurality of armature coils and a magnet unit." The Examiner then concludes that "[i]t would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Hawkswell to make the feeding unit capable of moving forward and backwards and driven by a force generating device comprising a plurality of armature coils and a magnet unit because it uses fewer moving parts making the device simpler and more robust."

However, Hawkswell and Briehl or Umetsu, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 15. That is, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Briehl of "a feeding unit capable of moving forward and backwards," as asserted by the Examiner. Moreover, independent claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, a "feeding unit comprising a forward and backward rotational force generating device," not merely a "feeding unit capable of moving forward and backwards."

Additionally, there is no disclosure or suggestion in either Briehl or Umetsu of a "feeding unit comprising a forward and backward rotational force generating device comprising a plurality of armature coils," as recited in independent claim 15. Moreover, neither Briehl nor Umetsu discloses or suggests "a force generating device comprising a plurality of armature coils and a magnet unit", as asserted by the Examiner. Rather, Briehl discloses an indexing gear motor 52 (see col. 5, lines 35-50 of Briehl), while Umetsu discloses motors 13a, 14a, 15a, and a stepping motor 9 (see col. 5, lines 13-37 and lines 48-53 of Umetsu); however, none of these motors are disclosed as generating both forward and backward rotational force or comprising a plurality of armature coils and a magnet unit.

Furthermore, Hawkswell specifically teaches that the drive means is “so constructed and arranged as to cause the drive wheel 52 to rotate through a predetermined angle of revolution in the operation of the machine to thereby feed the tape assembly 38, 40 a predetermined distance equal to the distance by which the pockets 42 (and thus the components in the pockets) are spaced apart on the carrying tape 38.” See col. 4, lines 27-37 of Hawkswell. Hawkswell further teaches that “[t]he drive means comprises a ratchet wheel (not visible in the drawings) mounted for rotation above the axis of the drive wheel whereby the drive wheel 52 is rotated when the ratchet wheel is rotated.” Additionally, Hawkswell teaches that “[a] spring member 56 is engageable with the ratchet wheel to prevent the ratchet reel rotating in a direction opposite to the feed direction.” See col. 4, lines 37-39 of Hawkswell. Thus, there would have been no motivation to modify Hawkswell in view of Briehl or Umetsu, as proposed by the Examiner, to produce the claimed features of independent claim 15, as such a modification teaches away from Hawkswell’s teachings and further would destroy Hawkswell’s drive means 52 for its intended purpose. Accordingly, it is clear that the Examiner’s proposed combination is improperly based on hindsight gleaned from Applicants’ own disclosure.

In the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action, the Examiner argues that:

Applicant argues that the combination of Hawkswell/Briehl/Umetsu does not anticipate a drive mechanism comprising a plurality of magnets and coils and the ability to move forwards and backwards and that Hawkswell teaches away from it. On the first point that the drive mechanism doesn’t comprise a plurality of magnets and coils, it is inherent in an electrical motor that a plurality of magnets and coils are needed to construct such a motor. As for the means Hawkswell teaches to prevent the unintentional reversing of the feed, the motors of Briehl

and Umetsu both include means to prevent the unintentional reverse feed of the strip while allowing for adjustment if necessary.

However, the Examiner's statement that "it is inherent in an electrical motor that a plurality of magnets and coils are needed to construct such a motor" is incorrect. Many electrical motors do not include a plurality of magnets and coils such as, for example, ball bearing motors, brushed DC electric motors, inchworm motors, linear motors, lynch motors, mendocino motors, piezoelectric motors, repulsion motors, stepper motors, traction motors, ultrasonic motors, and unipolar motors, all of which are considered electric motors. Further, as set forth above, independent claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, a feeding unit comprising a forward and backward rotational force generating device, while Briehl and Umetsu, as acknowledged by the Examiner, merely teach "means to prevent the unintentional reverse feed of the strip while allowing for adjustment if necessary."

Accordingly, the rejection of the independent claim 15 over Hawkswell and Briehl or Umetsu should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 16-17 are allowable over Hawkswell at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 15, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.


If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 10/825,361
Reply to Office Action of May 15, 2007

Docket No. MRE-0045.01

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3777 CLD:rlg

Date: September 12, 2007

\\Fk4\Documents\2021\2021-623\133036.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610